

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated March 23, 2006, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire June 23, 2006.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102, and Claims 3, 5, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103 for the reasons set forth below.

In the current paper, Claims 1-9 are canceled, and Claim 10 is amended for clarity. No new matter is entered. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all pending rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Rejection over Fujimoto

Claims 1-2, 6, 10-11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujimoto (US 6390597).

Claims 1, 2 and 6 are canceled, thereby obviating the rejections directed to these claims.

Claim 10 is amended herein to recite (in pertinent part):

A printing system comprising:

...means for causing the plurality ejectors to selectively eject material toward the substrate when the print head is moving in the first printing direction and for causing the plurality ejectors to selectively eject material toward the substrate when the print head is moving in the second printing direction,

wherein the first plurality of ejectors are arranged on the ejector base in a first line, the first line being diagonal to the first print direction and the second print direction.

Support for and the benefit of the amendment to Claim 1 is recited, for example, in paragraph 0050 of Applicants' specification:

[0050] Fig. 4b shows a bi-axial print head in accordance with another embodiment of the invention. Print head 430b includes multiple ejectors 440 arranged in a diagonal line across an ejector base 431b. Note that while six ejectors are shown for explanatory purposes, print head 430b could include any number of ejectors. The diagonal ejector arrangement of print head 430b allows multi-line printing to be performed in both the X axis and Y axis directions without print head or substrate rotation. Note that the throughput capability of print head 431b can be further optimized by setting the horizontal spacing Hb and the vertical spacing Wb between ejectors 440 according to the design rules of the IC layout being printed, as described previously with respect to print head 430a shown in Fig. 4a.

No new matter is entered by the amendment to Claim 10.

Fujimoto fails to anticipate amended Claim 10 at least because Fujimoto fails to teach or suggest "means for causing the plurality ejectors to selectively eject material toward the substrate when the print head is moving in the first printing direction and for causing the plurality ejectors to selectively eject material toward the substrate when the print head is moving in the second printing direction", as recited in amended Claim 10. Instead, Fujimoto only teaches printing in a primary printing direction.

Claims 11 and 15 depend from Claim 10, and are therefore allowable over Fujimoto for at least the same reasons that Claim 10 is allowable.

Rejection over Katagami

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 13 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Katagami (USPA 20020105688 A1).

Claims 1, 4 and 6-9 are canceled, thereby obviating the rejections directed to these claims.

Claim 10 (as amended herein) is believed to be distinguished over Katagami at least because Katagami fail to teach or suggest "means for causing the plurality ejectors to selectively eject material toward the substrate when the print head is moving in the first printing direction and for causing the plurality ejectors to selectively eject material toward the substrate when the print head is moving in the second printing direction", as recited in Claim 10. Like Fujimoto, Katagami is believed to only teach printing in a primary direction.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 102.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Rejections over Fujimoto and Minowa

Claims 3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujimoto in view of Minowa (USP 5936648).

Claim 3 is canceled herein.

Claim 12 is dependent from Claim 10, which is distinguished over Fujimoto for at least the reasons set forth above. Minowa fails to overcome the deficiencies of Fujimoto, discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 12.

Rejections over Katagami

Claims 3, 5, 12 and 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katagami in view of legal precedent.

Claims 3 and 5 are canceled herein.

Claims 12 and 15 is dependent from Claim 10, which is distinguished over Katagami for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 12 and 15.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 103.

CONCLUSION

Claims 10-20 are pending in the present Application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at (408) 451-5902 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 33726

Patrick T. Bever
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 33,834